

**CANTERBURY CIVIL DEFENCE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
GROUP JOINT COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2007
COMMENCING AT 10.00 A.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER,
ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY, 58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH**

PRESENT:

Joint Committee Members:

Cr Darryl Nelson	Ashburton District Council
Cr Sue Wells (Chairperson)	Christchurch City Council
Cr Angus McKay	Environment Canterbury
Cr Judy Meikle	Hurunui District Council
Mayor John O'Neill	Mackenzie District Council
Mayor Michael McEvedy	Selwyn District Council
Mayor Jim Gerard	Waimakariri District Council
Cr Ann Townend	Waimate District Council

CEG Members:

Bob Upton	CDEM Group Controller
Murray Sinclair	Christchurch City Council
John Talbot (from 10.30 a.m.)	Environment Canterbury
John Lovell	Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management
Mark Chubb	NZ Fire Service
Peter Summerfield	NZ Police
Paul Davey	Selwyn District Council

Others:

Sergeant Ray Blampied	NZ Police
Wilson Brown	Selwyn District Council

Canterbury Emergency Management Office Staff:

John Fisher	Regional Civil Defence Manager
Jon Mitchell	Group Emergency Management Planner

Environment Canterbury Staff:

Robyn Pay	Administration Officer
-----------	------------------------

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cr Kerry Burke (Chairman, Environment Canterbury), Mayor Garry Jackson (Hurunui District Council), Mayor Kevin Heays (Kaikoura District Council), and Cr Richard Lyon (Timaru District Council).

Apologies were also received from CEG members Stuart Grant (Kaikoura District Council) Craig McKay (NZ Police) and Jim Palmer (Waimakariri District Council).

As it was the first meeting attended by Crs Meikle and Townend, introductions were made around the table.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved

That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2006, as circulated, be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Mayor McEvedy – Mayor Gerard

3. MATTERS ARISING

- Paddy Clifford, Chair of CEG, referred to a previously-suggested need for a “stocktake” day – a time outside the normal meeting schedule to look at what the Group has achieved to date and where it is going in the future. He suggested that this day be held on 19 March. There was general support from the members for this date. The Joint Committee Chairperson said that items for the agenda would include the hazardscape, how well prepared Canterbury communities are to handle small events, and community preparedness and responsibility. It was noted that a wide range of agencies and partner organisations would be invited to attend. An agenda would be prepared for the day.
- The Chairperson referred to item 8 (Group Controller’s Report) and asked if the DHBs had been invited to attend these Joint Committee meetings. Staff confirmed that discussions have taken place, but there has been no response received back at this stage.
- Looking at the 2007 meeting dates (item 10), the Chairperson sought clarification on the status of this joint committee following the local body elections in October. It was confirmed that the committee stays in existence, but will need to be reformed with councils making new nominations for membership, and with a new Committee Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson needing to be elected.

MATTERS FOR DECISION

4. EMO SECOND QUARTER REPORT 2006-2007

John Fisher presented the report to the Committee, and sought questions. The following item (Item 5 CDEM Group Work Programme Report) was discussed in conjunction with this item, and it was agreed that in future it would be helpful if the two reports could be joined together as one.

Points and questions raised included:

Readiness/Response

- The Chairperson referred to the staffing levels for the ECCs (1.2) and sought confirmation that sufficient staff were available. The Regional Civil Defence Manager confirmed that there were sufficient staff in place for 2-3 shifts in the ECC, and training is being provided. He noted however that there is always room for more staff. He confirmed that the alternate ECC refers to the Christchurch Art Gallery, which would be used in the event that the Kilmore Street ECC was unable to be used for any reason (ie only one ECC would be used at any one time).
- Cr Townend sought clarification on the Notes to this section referring to the claim submitted to MCDEM following the June 2006 snow event. Staff explained that the claim is spread over two financial years (with the amount relating to 2005/06 being accrued to that year’s accounts).
- Cr Nelson sought clarification on who pays for helicopter hire in events such as the June 2006 snowstorm. It was confirmed that there are very clear guidelines – if the helicopter is used to meet welfare requirements, then the total cost is recoverable.

However it is used for other purposes (eg reconnaissance), then the cost is borne by the organisation concerned. It was stressed that the use must be very clear, and should be well documented at the time. Cr Nelson noted that in this particular event, the Prime Minister and Minister of CDEM flew around the region in a helicopter. Staff confirmed that the Crown would have paid for this.

- Referring to use of helicopters, Mayor O'Neill said that there was an expectation that the Council would pay for any helicopter use. He considered there needed to be stronger messages to the community regarding responsibility, so that people's expectations were more realistic in an emergency. The Chairperson said this matter would be discussed on 19 March.
- There was discussion on the time delays in having the claims paid out. Cr Nelson asked if interest would be payable on the amount owed. John Lovell said that interest would not be paid. He noted that councils were encouraged to get their claims in as soon as possible. Once received, claims have to go through an approval process involving the Ministry, the Department of Internal Affairs and Cabinet. Mayor McEvedy suggested that a future way around the delays might be to put in a series of claims (say, monthly) rather than waiting until all costs are to hand before submitting one large claim. Ministry staff and committee members supported this suggestion. The Chairperson asked for a report back from staff on why there have been delays with the claim (including the date the claim was lodged and the reasons for the length of time before lodgement), and looking at options for the future, including lodging of monthly claims.

Training

- The Chairperson asked about the significance of 3.8 – which notes that it is unlikely that the Group EMO will conduct any training on behalf of the Ministry this year. Staff confirmed that the impact on the budget would be minimal.
- Project Rea 04/01 CDEM Training Development in the work programme was discussed. Jon Mitchell reported that negotiations with the Justice Institute of British Columbia for access to their training packages are now almost complete. A one-off lump sum payment has been agreed to, giving this Group open-ended and exclusive access to the packages in New Zealand. The EOC 2 package is being developed now, with other packages to follow.
- The Chairperson asked when the Joint Committee could receive a report on Pandora 2006. Staff confirmed that this exercise had been fully reported to the CEG's January meeting. The Chairperson said that it would be beneficial for the Joint Committee to receive a report at a higher (non-operational detail) level.

Engineering Lifelines

- The Chairperson referred to the comments for 7.6 Preparation of a Lifelines Inventory. Staff confirmed that more work would be undertaken on this project, including looking at the possibility of councils meeting the requirements the collectively. Mayor O'Neill considered that it is hard to anticipate and be prepared for a major event (such as a major seismic event), and he noted that preparedness for the smaller events was of major concern to his council. Cr Townend said it is important that elected representatives are aware of their own council's situation. It was noted that the completed scoping report would be circulated within the next few weeks, and timelines going forward would then be identified.

During discussion on this report, the Chairperson expressed concern that the joint committee was being presented with too much detail, and it was becoming difficult to maintain the necessary higher level overview.

Resolved

That the quarterly report be received.

Cr Nelson – Mayor McEvedy

5. CDEM GROUP WORK PROGRAMME REPORT

Jon Mitchell presented this report, and several items from the report were discussed with the previous item. Additional matters raised included:

- Rea 04/02 – Jon Mitchell reported that Canterbury is well ahead of the rest of the country in this work. Mayor O'Neill considered that information management can be a burden during an event, noting that often there is no power or telephone available for use. The Group Controller reminded the meeting that radios invariably work when phones and cellphones do not. EMO staff emphasised the importance of managing the collection, analyses and dissemination of information during an emergency. Management of public information is also important.
- Mark Chubb reminded the meeting that emergency management should be comprehensive – including risk reduction, not just concentrating on response. Noting that not all councils are equal in terms of readiness etc, he said it is important that members have tolerance and patience to facilitate development across the whole region to meet community's varying needs and abilities.

Resolved

That the report be received.

Cr McKay – Cr Townend

6. DRAFT CDEM GROUP BUDGET 2007-2008

A replacement report was circulated to the meeting. In presenting the report, John Fisher noted that the replacement budget shows a \$30,000 reduction in overheads due to some work still being done on budget overheads by Environment Canterbury's finance section. There may still be some more small movements in overheads.

The report noted that detailed checking of the LTCCP figures revealed that two items (totalling \$15,000) added by the Joint Committee in March 2006 had not been included in the LTCCP figures. These have now been added in the LTCCP figures, resulting in an increase in gross budget compared with 2006-2007 of \$25,546.

The following points were raised:

- The Chairperson sought clarification on the notes to Public Education and Public Information (page 6 of the tabled document) regarding the provision of support by Environment Canterbury communications staff. John Fisher noted that the work referred to is in addition to the half time staff position in the budget. The funding has been transferred from Environment Canterbury labour to Goods and Services. This has been identified in discussions with the Communications Manager as an efficient and effective way of getting the precise skill sets required for various jobs.
- Cr Nelson sought details of the standby generator item on page 8 (Readiness Response). Staff confirmed that the Group charge relates to the use of the generator to power up the ECC and other space needed to support the ECC (Environment Canterbury pays for the rest). As previously requested by the committee, it is listed as a separate line item rather than being included in rental,
- Mayor McEvedy referred to the note to Group Training (page 5) regarding the intention to split out the Private Training Establishment (PTE) costs as a separate project, but this is not possible at the moment because of issues with the new Environment Canterbury budget database. Staff confirmed these were "settling down" problems, and it will be possible to identify the PTE costs separately later on.

Resolved

That the Draft CDEM Group Budget 2007-2008, as amended, be approved for inclusion in the Environment Canterbury Draft Annual Plan.

Cr Nelson – Cr Meikle

7. CDEM GROUP LTCCP 2006-16 LEVELS OF SERVICE

John Fisher prepared this report that proposed measures and targets for the 3rd Level of Service in the Canterbury CDEM Group LTCCP 2006 -16. (Measures and targets already exist for Levels 1, 2 and 4.)

The proposed measures and targets were reviewed by a small working party late in 2006, and new measures and targets were agreed to:

Proposed Measures	Proposed Targets
1. Identified the hazards that affect their critical infrastructure.	100% by 2009
2. Determined the impacts of those relevant hazards on infrastructure and operations	100% by 2012
3. Have put in place a management programme to mitigate the unwanted effects of the hazards	100% by 2016

This report was discussed at the CEG meeting on 29 January and recommended to the Joint Committee for adoption.

Resolved

That the proposed measures and targets for the 3rd Level of Service in the Canterbury CDEM Group LTCCP 2006-16 be approved for inclusion in the Group section of the Environment Canterbury 2007/08 Draft Annual Plan.

Cr Wells – Mayor McEvedy

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

8. WARNING SYSTEMS

Jon Mitchell summarised this information report with a Power Point presentation, outlining the current situation, gaps in current arrangements, community expectations, and options to improve the situation.

The decisions made by CEG at its 29 January meeting were noted:

- (a) That the Group Emergency Office and Environment Canterbury develop generic tsunami hazard, warning and evacuation information pamphlets and signage for adaptation and implementation by member authorities in at-risk communities.
- (b) That the CDEM Group project to develop a warning system model incorporate a wider range of means of communicating warnings.
- (c) That the CDEM Group encourages the Ministry of CDEM to include enhancements to local warning systems within projects to enhance the “National Warning System” and the National CDEM Plan, and to give a high priority to projects relating to warning systems.

Mark Chubb noted that there is widespread public perception that warning systems refer only to technological means. However he reiterated that literature and prototype systems around the world point to it being more than this; it is a mix of the environment, other people and technology. All three components are required for an effective response.

Resolved

That the report be received.

Cr Wells – Mayor McEvedy

9. CHRISTCHURCH CITY EVACUATION PLAN

Sergeant Ray Blampied (NZ Police) gave an oral presentation of this plan. NZ Police had prepared the plan in consultation with Christchurch City Council, and advice had been received from Civil Defence staff and University of Canterbury thesis students, and the Risks and Realities publication had been useful.

Major points in the plan included:

- The plan will be ongoing, and will be amended as further information comes to hand following exercises and events.
- The plan identified areas at risk on the coast, and these areas have been assigned into manageable sectors (19). It may be necessary to identify some secondary evacuation areas identified (eg Lyttelton Harbour and other Banks Peninsula bays).
- Seven of the sectors have been given high priority status.
- The plan assumes a declaration will be made, and a six-hour lead-in time.
- Resources required will be one “door knocker” per 50 houses.
- There is a one-hour mobilisation target for Coastal Evacuation Sector Teams to get to the high priority sectors (2832 households in the five high priority sectors in Christchurch City; 80 personnel required).
- 240 personnel required for all 19 sectors (8670 households, 22,500 people).
- The plan includes a sample sector evacuation plan including risk locations and egress route/s.
- The plan includes a coastal evacuation checklist.
- Warnings for public evacuation will be made by various means – door knocking, noise, visual alerts, alert messages, radio/television broadcasts, neighbourhood support, residents’ association.
- The plan includes standard warning for a tsunami.
- The traffic plan includes details of cordons and barriers.
- Further warnings will be required to the hill suburb residents.
- Special needs areas need to be identified.
- CCC CD welfare facilities will be used.
- Further work to be done on the plan includes public education, household posters, Community Board presentations, coastal flood and tsunami warning signs, visual indicators for evacuated households, assessment of risk/need for secondary evacuation zones, assessment of the risk/need for evacuation resources for other TA river mouth settlements (eg Waimakariri, Selwyn, Ashburton, Waimate).

Matters raised by committee members included:

- There was discussion about people being able to take pets with them. Sergeant Blampied and Murray Sinclair confirmed that animals would be able to be housed at the racecourse, and people were more likely to co-operate with an evacuation if they could take their pets with them. Discussions have been held with the SPCA and Christchurch City Council Animal Control.

- Cr Wells asked about the rationale of the warning not including an expected time of arrival of the wave, particularly when people would get such information from various media. Sergeant Blampied said that matter would be looked at further, but it was agreed that there were risks with both options – giving an expected time, or not.
- In view of the lack of commonality in any warning system, members were mindful of capturing all people in any particular area. This was seen as possibly more difficult in coastal holiday locations. The importance of having information (eg posters) widely distributed was stressed.
- Cr Wells noted that the report has assumed a six-hour lead-in time. She asked about the possibility of a near-field tsunami with a much shorter lead-in time. Various people noted that the risk of a near-field event in New Zealand was very small (except for Kaikoura, when any lead-in time would be a matter of minutes) because of undersea geological conditions around New Zealand. An extensive coastal survey of New Zealand is currently being undertaken, which may provide more information.
- Several members expressed an interest in getting a copy of Sergeant Blampied's presentation for use by their council/communities. Sergeant Blampied said a version is being prepared for public consumption.

The Chairperson thanked Sergeant Blampied for his excellent presentation.

Resolved

That the information be received.

Cr Wells – Mayor McEvedy

10. GROUP CONTROLLER'S REPORT

Bob Upton presented his report that covered:

- ECC training
- Proposed visits to territorial authorities
- Welfare Advisory Group MOUs
- pandemic planning
- Exercise Pandora 2006 and 2007
- Preparation of Emergency Support Team Policy
- Preparation of Group Telecommunications Plan

In answer to a question, the Group Controller confirmed Exercise Pandora 2007 dates as 14/15 September.

Resolved

That the report be received.

Cr Wells – Mayor McEvedy

11. PANDEMIC EXERCISE: EXERCISE CRUICKSHANK

Jon Mitchell gave a Power Point presentation on this exercise that will consist of four phases to be held on 10 May, 16 May, 17 May and 23 May. In Canterbury the exercise will take a joint approach between the DHB and the CDEMG, with a Joint Co-ordination Centre located at the ECC.

Particular points raised included:

- The need for involvement of all partner organisations, with particular emphasis on the inclusion of PHO's.
- Government is hopeful that this will be the only major pandemic exercise.
- Importance of territorial authorities maintaining strong links and working relationships with PHO's in their districts.
- Inclusion of South Canterbury, as well as North Canterbury, District Health Board.
- Exercise to include national and local scenarios.
- The pandemic planning being carried out does not relate specifically to any short/medium-term threat from bird flu, but rather relates to an assumption that there will be a human pandemic of some sort within the next 30 years.

Mayor O'Neill asked about powers of the Police to prevent people moving from one district (or area) to another in the event of a real pandemic. It was confirmed that Police have powers at borders but do not have powers or resources to restrict movements within the country. Public advice would be given for people to stay where they are, but enforcement is another issue.

Resolved

That the information be received.

Cr Wells – Mayor McEvedy

12. LONG TERM COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLANS (LTCCPs)

The Chairperson considered it important that the Joint Committee has a good understanding of where each Council is at with their intentions in the CDEM area, with particular reference to proposed 2007-2008 Annual Plans. She asked if the CEG looks at these matters.

Paddy Clifford, Chairman of CEG, said that CEG does not specifically look at this issue in any organised way. However at the recent CEG meeting one authority had reported the intention of his Council to drastically reduce its funding in this area in this year's Annual Plan. Proposed funding levels would be insufficient to support any CDEM staff for the district.

The Chairperson suggested that each Council could provide the relative page/s from its Draft Annual Plan. There was some discussion on whether this was an issue for the Joint Committee or CEG, with the suggestion the Joint Committee was the right group as they could consider making submissions to Council's Annual Plans.

It was noted that local authorities are responsible to their ratepayers – ratepayers may support lowering the level of service in one area while increasing it in another. This would be identified in the annual plan public submission process. Another issue is the responsibility of member authorities to the CDEM Group. The meeting was reminded that, as a Joint Committee, the CDEM Group is a committee of each and all member authorities.

Mayor O'Neill cautioned against judging each authority by financial contribution only. A physical assessment of preparedness may be more appropriate. This suggestion was supported by Paddy Clifford, who favoured an assessment of what each local authority is providing/has planned for. John Lovell, MCDEM representative on the CEG, also supported some form of reporting.

The CEG Chairman noted concerns expressed at the recent CEG meeting about expectations placed on other Group members if one member did not meet its requirements. Mayor Gerard asked about powers available to the Group if one of its members did not meet its obligations. It was confirmed that the Group has no legal powers, but Section 75 of the CDEM Act does provide some powers to the Director.

It was confirmed that in the particular instance referred to, a meeting has been sought with the Ministry to work through the issues. Working collectively with neighbouring authorities may address some of the concerns. Attendance of other Group members at that meeting was seen as desirable.

It was agreed that this matter will be discussed further at the meeting proposed for 19 March. Mayor Gerard reminded the meeting that the opportunity for submitting to local authority annual plans must not be lost.

13. GENERAL BUSINESS

John Lovell reported on a meeting to take place between the Minister of CDEM and representatives from all South Island CDEM Groups. The date for this meeting has now been confirmed as 1 March (approximate timing 10am – 3pm). The Joint Committee Chairperson advised of her unavailability on this day because she has been appointed by the Christchurch City Council as one of its representatives on the UDS hearing panel. The Deputy Chairperson of the Joint Committee Mayor McEvedy will be available for part of this day. The CEG Chairman signalled his availability.

Mr Lovell asked for any agenda items to be notified to him by early next week. Three items had been identified in brief discussions with EMO staff:

- Tsunami
- Public education
- Pandemic planning

The meeting added the following additional items:

- Reimbursement of claims following emergency events
- Review of the National Plan
- Responsibilities of member authorities (reference discussion in item 12 above)

14. NEXT MEETING

Monday, 21 May 2007 (with an additional informal meeting scheduled for 19 March)

15. CLOSURE

The meeting concluded at 1.15 p.m.

CONFIRMED

Date: _____ **Chairperson**